



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,474	07/11/2001	Norman Wesley Gimbert	13DV-14215	9339
<div>7590 01/12/2007 John S. Beulick Armstrong Teasdale LLP One metropolitan Sq., Suite 2600 St. Louis, MO 63102</div>			<div>EXAMINER ABEL JALIL NEVEEN</div> <div>ART UNIT 2165 PAPER NUMBER</div>	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/12/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/903,474	Applicant(s) GIMBERT ET AL.	
	Examiner Neveen Abel-Jalil	Art Unit 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Neveen Abel-Jalil
Neveen

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. The Amendment filed on October 25, 2006 has been received and entered. Claims 1-18 are pending.
2. Applicant's Amendment has overcome the previous claim objections, and rejections under 35 USC 101, and most of the rejections under 35 USC 112, second.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 6 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 6 and 13, in lines 22, and 21, respectively, recite the limitation "enabling to" is indirect, suggest optionally, and passive which renders any recitation claimed after not be given patentable weight. Appropriate correction is required.

The Examiner points to MPEP 2106 [III-C] wherein the claim's recitation of "enabled to" raises the question to Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation.

Office personnel must rely on the applicant's disclosure to properly determine the meaning of ** the claims. Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim; therefore, in this case, the recitation of "enabled to" as interpreted in light of the specification provide the "functionality" or "the capability" of the database

Art Unit: 2165

management system to perform the steps without definite disclosure limiting or excluding any alternative, negative, or even all together suggest actually performing or implementing the functionality that is database management system is capable of.

Therefore, any cited art that teaches the steps otherwise in the alternative can be used to reject the instant application. The computer being adapted to perform a function does not mean that it will ever actually perform that functionality (i.e. "enabled to" should be clarified and changed to a more definite term such as "providing the user access").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the structure" in the very last sentence of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 13, line 6, recites "to cause to be displayed" which is vague and unclear. What is exactly being claimed? The display or the configuration or the functionality of being displayed? Correction is required.

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Since the claim does not distinct the preamble from the body of the claims. The Examiner is unclear on what constitutes the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hobbs (U.S. Patent No. 6,523,022 B1) in view of DaCosta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,826,553 B1).

As to claim 6, Hobbs discloses a system of communicating information to a user via a computer including a browser, said system comprising:

a first server system controlled and operated by a first business entity comprising a first web server and a first database including data owned by the first business entity, said first web server coupled to said first database and to said network, said first web server displays a first web site populated with data from said first database at the user computer; and

a second server system controlled and operated by a second business entity comprising a second web server and a second database including data owned by the second business entity, said second web server coupled to said second database and to said network, said second web

Art Unit: 2165

server displays at user computer a second web site populated with data from said second database, said first web site and said second web site synchronized to function together as a collaborative web site wherein at least a portion of the data included in the collaborative website is hosted from the first website by the first business entity and at least a portion of the data included in the collaborative website is hosted from the second website by the second business entity wherein the collaborative web site is hosted jointly by the first and second business entity, and the data stored in said first server system database is accessible to a user browser via said second server system, and the data stored in said second server system database is accessible to the user browser via said first server system, and the collaborative website is displayed to the user enabling the user to access data stored in at least one of said first and second server system.

Hobbs does not teach at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes in a spreadsheet format.

DaCosta et al. teaches at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes in a spreadsheet format (See DaCosta et al. column 5, lines 13-25, also see DaCosta et al. column 6, lines 42-47, and see DaCosta et al. column 12, lines 1-4, and DaCosta et al. column 17, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hobbs by the teaching of DaCosta et al. to include recording changes in the structure of at least one of the first and second web sites in a spreadsheet format because it is well known in the art to utilize various applications including spreadsheets to store website log data.

As to claim 7, Hobbs as modified discloses wherein said data stored in said first server system and said second server system accessible to the user browser based on individual access privileges (See Hobbs column 10, lines 25-27).

9. Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hobbs (U.S. Patent No. 6,523,022 B1) in view of DaCosta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,826,553 B1), and further in view of Garrow et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0194160 A1).

As to claim 1, Hobbs discloses a method for communicating information using a system including a first server system controlled and operated by a first business entity and a second server system operated by a second business entity, the first server system including a first web server hosting a website of the first business entity and a first database including data owned by the first business entity, the second server system including a second web server hosting a website of the second business entity and a second database including data owned by the second business entity, said method comprising the steps of:

coupling the first web server to the first database controlled by the first business entity, wherein the first web server populates a first web site with data from the first database, the data including information that the first business entity wants to share with the second business entity (See Hobbs column 14, lines 50-65, wherein "first server system" deemed to include the original Web site of the business –i.e. "E&Y, Lexis/Nexis");

coupling the second web server to the second database controlled by the second business entity, wherein the second web server populates a second web site with data from the second

database, the data including information that the second business entity wants to share with the first business entity (See Hobbs column 25, lines 29-35, and Hobbs column 28, lines 44-60, also see Hobbs column 14, lines 50-65, wherein “second server system” deemed to include the “warehouse system”);

synchronizing the first web site and the second web site to function together as a collaborative web site wherein at least a portion of the data included in the collaborative website is hosted from the first website by the first business entity and at least a portion of the data included in the collaborative website is hosted from the second website by the second business entity wherein the collaborative web site is hosted jointly by the first and second business entity (See Hobbs column 3, lines 50-52, prior art., also see Hobbs column 7, lines 19-29, and see Hobbs column 10, lines 13-27); and

accessing the first web site and the data stored in the first server system database by a user associated with the second business entity via the collaborative website (See Hobbs column 25, lines 11-20);

accessing the second web site and the data stored in the second server system database by a user associated with the first business entity to select a link displayed on the collaborative website (See Hobbs column 25, lines 11-20, also see Hobbs Figure 6).

Hobbs does not teach recording changes in the structure of at least one of the first and second web sites in a spreadsheet format.

DaCosta et al. teaches recording changes in the structure of at least one of the first and second web sites in a spreadsheet format (See DaCosta et al. column 5, lines 13-25, also see

DaCosta et al. column 6, lines 42-47, and see DaCosta et al. column 12, lines 1-4, and DaCosta et al. column 17, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hobbs by the teaching of DaCosta et al. to include recording changes in the structure of at least one of the first and second web sites in a spreadsheet format because it is well known in the art to utilize various applications including spreadsheets to store website log data.

Hobbs as modified still does not teach aircraft and aircraft engine information.

Garrow et al. teaches aircraft and aircraft engine information (See Garrow et al. page 6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Garrow et al. to include aircraft and aircraft engine information because providing specific records dealing with one industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking of information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

As to claim 2, Hobbs as modified discloses wherein said step of coupling the first web server to the first database further comprises the step of providing a first server system (See Hobbs column 11, lines 63-67, also see Hobbs column 14, lines 45-59) hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer (See Garrow et al. page 6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

As to claim 3, Hobbs as modified discloses wherein said step of coupling the second web server to the second database further comprises the step of providing a second server system hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer (See Garrow et al. page 6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

As to claim 4, Hobbs as modified discloses wherein said step of accessing the first web site and the data stored in the first server system further comprises the step of accessing data from the first and second server systems based on individual access privileges (See Hobbs column 11, lines 63-67, also see Hobbs column 14, lines 45-59).

As to claim 5, Hobbs as modified discloses wherein said step of accessing data stored in the first server system further comprises the step of selectively accessing (See Hobbs column 11, lines 63-67, also see Hobbs column 14, lines 45-59) at least one of aircraft engine and aircraft data relating to at least one of general information data, plans and schedules data, propulsion systems data, and engineering data (See Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

As to claim 8, Hobbs as modified discloses said first server system, said second server system hosted by a business partner (See Hobbs column 35, lines 27-35, wherein “partner” reads on “sponsor”).

Hobbs as modified still does not teach hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer.

Garrow et al. teaches hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer (See Garrow et al. page 6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Garrow et al. to include hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer because providing specific records dealing with one industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking of information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

As to claims 9, and 10, Hobbs as modified discloses wherein at least one of said first database and said second (See Hobbs column 25, lines 12-17).

Hobbs as modified still does not teach database includes aircraft engine data relating to at least one of general information data, propulsion systems data, and engineering.

Garrow et al. teaches database includes aircraft engine data relating to at least one of general information data, propulsion systems data, and engineering (See Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Garrow et al. to include hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer; hosted by a business partner of the aircraft engine manufacturer; and at least one of plans and schedules, propulsion systems, and engineering because providing specific records dealing with one industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking of information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

As to claim 12, Hobbs discloses a database structure configured to be protected from access by unauthorized individuals, said database structure comprising a first database and a second database, said first database coupled to a first server system controlled and hosted by (a business) (See Hobbs column 14, lines 50-65, wherein “first server system” deemed to include the original Web site of the business –i.e. “E&Y, Lexis/Nexis”), said second database coupled to a second server system controlled and hosted by (a second business) (See Hobbs column 14, lines 50-65, wherein “second server system” deemed to include the “warehouse system”), at least one of said first database and said second database including information relating to at least one of general information, said first database linked to a first web site configured to be populated with data from said first database, said second database linked to a second web site configured to be populated from said second database, said first web site and said second web site synchronized to function together as a collaborative web site wherein at least portion of the data included in the collaborative website is hosted from the first website by the manufacturer and at least a portion of the data included in the collaborative website is hosted from the second website wherein the collaborative web site is hosted jointly by the first and second business entity (See Hobbs column 3, lines 50-52, prior art., also see Hobbs column 7, lines 19-29, also see Hobbs column 9, lines 8-25, wherein “first system” and “second system” reads on “first network source” and “second network source”, and see Hobbs column 10, lines 20-27).

Hobbs does not teach at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes in a spreadsheet format.

DaCosta et al. teaches at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes in a spreadsheet format (See DaCosta et al. column 5,

Art Unit: 2165

lines 13-25, also see DaCosta et al. column 6, lines 42-47, and see DaCosta et al. column 12, lines 1-4, and DaCosta et al. column 17, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hobbs by the teaching of DaCosta et al. to include recording changes in the structure of at least one of the first and second web sites in a spreadsheet format because it is well known in the art to utilize various applications including spreadsheets to store website log data.

Hobbs as modified still does not teach controlled and hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer; controlled and hosted by a business partner of the aircraft engine manufacturer; and at least one of plans and schedules, propulsion systems, and engineering.

Garrow et al. teaches hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer; hosted by a business partner of the aircraft engine manufacturer (See Garrow et al. page 6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071); and at least one of plans and schedules, propulsion systems, and engineering (See Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Garrow et al. to include hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer; hosted by a business partner of the aircraft engine manufacturer; and at least one of plans and schedules, propulsion systems, and engineering because providing specific records dealing with one industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking of information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

As to claim 13, Hobbs discloses a web-based communications system comprising:

a computer comprising a browser; a network coupled to said computer (See Hobbs Figure 4, shows a networked computer with a browser);

a first server system controlled and operated (by a business) comprising a first web server and a first database, said first web server coupled to said first database and to said network, said first web server configured to cause to be displayed at said computer a first web site populated with data from said first database (See Hobbs column 14, lines 50-65, wherein “first server system” deemed to include the original Web site of the business –i.e. “E&Y, Lexis/Nexis”); and

a second server system controlled and operated (by a second business) comprising a second web server and a second database, said second web server coupled to said second database and to said network, said second web server configured to cause to be displayed at said computer a second web site populated with data from said second database (See Hobbs column 14, lines 50-65, wherein “second server system” deemed to include the “warehouse system”), said first web site and said second web site synchronized to function together as a collaborative web site wherein at least a portion of the data included in the collaborative website is hosted from the first website and at least a portion of the data included in the collaborative website is hosted from the second website wherein the collaborative web site is hosted jointly by the first and second business entity, and the data stored in said first server system database is accessible to a user browser via said second server system, and the data stored in said second server system database is accessible to said user browser via said first server system (See Hobbs column 3, lines 50-52, prior art., also see Hobbs column 7, lines 19-29, also see Hobbs column 9, lines 8-

25, wherein “first system” and “second system” reads on “first network source” and “second network source”, and see Hobbs column 10, lines 20-27).

Hobbs does not teach at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes in a spreadsheet format.

DaCosta et al. teaches at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes in a spreadsheet format (See DaCosta et al. column 5, lines 13-25, also see DaCosta et al. column 6, lines 42-47, and see DaCosta et al. column 12, lines 1-4, and DaCosta et al. column 17, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hobbs by the teaching of DaCosta et al. to include recording changes in the structure of at least one of the first and second web sites in a spreadsheet format because it is well known in the art to utilize various applications including spreadsheets to store website log data.

Hobbs as modified still does not teach the business being an aircraft engine manufacturer and second business being a partner of the aircraft manufacturer.

Garrow et al. teaches the business being an aircraft engine manufacturer and second business being a partner of the aircraft manufacturer (See Garrow et al. page 6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Garrow et al. to include hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer or a partner of the aircraft manufacturer because

providing specific records dealing with one industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking of information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

As to claim 14, Hobbs as modified discloses said first server system hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer, said second server system hosted by an aircraft manufacturer (See Garrow et al. page 6, paragraph 0058, also see Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071, wherein “turbine engine” reads on “jet engine”).

As to claim 15, Hobbs as modified discloses wherein said data stored in said first server system and said second server system accessible to the user browser based on based on individual access privileges (See Hobbs column 11, lines 63-67).

As to claims 16, and 18, Hobbs as modified discloses wherein said browser configured to display aircraft engine data relating to at least one of general information data, plans and schedules data, propulsion systems data, and engineering data (See Garrow et al. column 9, lines 47-67, also see Garrow et al. page 8, paragraphs 0068-0071).

10. Claims 11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hobbs (U.S. Patent 6,523,022 B1) in view of DaCosta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,826,553 B1), further in view of Garrow et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0194160 A1) as applied to claims 2-3, 5-10, 12, 14-16, and 18 above, and still further in view of Glass et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,278,965).

As to claim 11 Hobbs as modified teaches said first database and said second database (See Hobbs column 2, lines 47-51).

Hobbs as modified still does not teach wherein at least one of said database maintains a record of navigation changes.

Glass et al. teaches wherein at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes (See Glass et al. column 5, lines 34-51, wherein “maintains a record” reads on “flight history”, also see Glass et al. column 22, lines 38-63, wherein “navigational changes” reads on “flight plans”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Glass et al. to include wherein at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

As to claim 17, Hobbs as modified still does not teach wherein said browser configured to selectively display an historical log relating to navigational changes to said user interface.

Glass et al. teaches wherein said browser configured to selectively display an historical log (See Glass et al. column 5, lines 41-48) relating to navigational changes (See Glass et al. column 5, lines 34-51, wherein “maintains a record” reads on “flight history”, also see Glass et al. column 22, lines 38-63, wherein “navigational changes” reads on “flight plans”) to said user interface (See Glass et al. column 11, lines 12-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Hobbs as modified by the teaching of Glass et al. to include wherein said browser configured to selectively display an historical log relating to navigational changes to said user interface because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Although most of applicant's arguments appear to be directed to the newly amended limitation. Some arguments appear to be directed to existing limitations.

In response to applicant's argument that "Hobbs does not teach or suggest a system of communication aircraft and aircraft engine information including a first server and database controlled and operated by a first business entity and a second server and database controlled and operated by a second business entity, wherein the two business entities can access each server and database via a web browser" is acknowledged but not deemed to be persuasive.

The combination of Hobbs and references cited in the office action teach GUI (204) correlating and synchronizing the records of multiple databases (i.e. shared collaborative portal) wherein each database is connected through an application server (each with its own database server) that is operated and controlled by a separate business entity, see Hobbs column 16, lines

63-66, and see Hobbs column 17, lines 4-11, and Hobbs column 28, lines 45-55. Hobbs, in general, teaches a subscription-based portal displaying links of information once selected provides access to separate remote databases to retrieved actual data; thus reading on the argued limitation. There does not appear to be any further distinction made in the claims to the contrary.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 571-272-4074. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM EST.

Art Unit: 2165

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'N. Abel-Jalil', with a large, sweeping flourish extending to the left.

Neeven Abel-Jalil
January 5, 2007